

1 THE HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
12 AT SEATTLE
13
14

15 MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

19 Defendant.

20 NO. 2:15-cv-01605-RSM

21 **STIPULATED MOTION AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

22 NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
23 May 12, 2022

24
25 The above-captioned action is for declaratory and injunctive relief under the Freedom of
26 Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, as amended, and the Administrative Procedure Act,
5 U.S.C. § 701 et seq. On April 29, 2022, Defendant filed a Motion for Summary Judgment
 (“Defendant’s Motion” or “Motion”) with a noting date of June 27, 2022. *See* Doc. 51. Under
 Local Civil Rule 7(d), Plaintiff has until June 20, 2022, to file its response to Defendant’s Motion.
 Given the broad scope of this matter, the numerous complex issues potentially subject to briefing,
 and the breadth of Defendant’s Motion, its declarations, and exhibits, the parties stipulate to
 Plaintiff’s request that the Court extend the deadline for Plaintiff to file its response an additional

1 32 days, up to and including July 22, 2022. Plaintiff anticipates that this will be its only request
 2 to extend the deadline to file its response.¹ In support of this request, the parties state the following:

3 1. For the last two years, the parties have worked together to narrow the issues before
 4 the Court and to resolve various matters without Court intervention. During that time, Defendant
 5 shared with Plaintiff certain draft declarations regarding Defendant's search efforts and draft
 6 *Vaughn* indices. Plaintiff's counsel provided detailed comments on those declarations and *Vaughn*
 7 indices in multiple emails to Defendant's counsel and comprehensive letters dated November 30,
 8 2020, December 11, 2020, January 13, 2021, March 9, 2021, July 28, 2021, September 22, 2021,
 9 and November 10, 2021. In addition, Plaintiff's counsel and Defendant's counsel held several
 10 telephonic conferences regarding Plaintiff's counsel's comments.

11 2. Defendant's response to Plaintiff's comments included several letters, material
 12 edits to its search effort declarations, the release in full of additional records, and an expanded
 13 *Vaughn* index. In addition, while responding to certain issues raised by Plaintiff regarding
 14 Defendant's draft *Vaughn* index, Defendant discovered that its draft *Vaughn* index was
 15 incomplete. As a result, Defendant recently added approximately 4,460 additional entries to its
 16 *Vaughn* index. Defendant has represented that it withheld from production approximately 13,000
 17 document pages in part, and 49,400 document pages in full.

18 3. On April 29, 2022, Defendant filed its Motion and supporting papers, totaling 691
 19 pages. Defendant claims exemptions from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(2), (b)(3), (b)(4),
 20 (b)(5), (b)(7)(A), and (b)(7)(C). As part of its 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(5) exemption claims, Defendant
 21 withheld documents under the deliberative process privilege, the attorney-client privilege, and the
 22 work product doctrine.

23
 24
 25 1 Defendant also intends to make a request to extend its reply deadline to Plaintiff's opposition. To ensure that an
 26 extension request for the reply deadline is made only once, Defendant intends to wait until after Plaintiff has filed its
 opposition to obtain a better estimate of the time needed to prepare its reply.

4. Defendant's Motion presents complex issues of fact and law regarding Defendant's search efforts and exemption claims.

5. On April 29, 2022, Defendant also filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in the parties' related FOIA matter. *See* Dkt. 2:15-cv-00369 RSM, Doc. 63.

6. Plaintiff requests additional time to fully evaluate Defendant's Motion, declarations, and exhibits (including its *Vaughn* index) to prepare its response.

5. Accordingly, the parties stipulate to Plaintiff's request that the Court extend the deadline for Plaintiff to file its response an additional 32 days, up to and including July 22, 2022.

DATED this 12th day of May, 2022.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CALFO EAKES LLP

By: s/ Stephen S. Ho

Stephen S. Ho
Trial Attorney, Tax Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Post Office Box 227
Washington, DC 20044
Tel: (202) 616-8994
Fax: (202) 514-6866
Email: stephen.s.ho@usdoj.gov

By: *s/ Patricia A. Eakes*

Patricia A. Eakes, WSBA #18888
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 407-2200
Email: pattye@calfoeakes.com

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

Attorney for Defendant Internal Revenue Service

By: *s/ Daniel A. Rosen*

Daniel A. Rosen, NYBA #2790442
(pro hac vice)
452 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Phone: (212) 626-4272
Email: daniel.rosen@bakermckenzie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation

STIPULATED MOTION & [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PLTF'S RESPONSE TO
DEF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT – Page 3
(No. 2:15-cv-01605-RSM)

LAW OFFICES
CALFO EAKES LLP

[PROPOSED] ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED this ____ day of _____, 2022.

THE HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented by:

CALFO EAKES LLP

By: s/ Patricia A. Eakes

Patricia A. Eakes, WSBA #18888
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2800
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 407-2200
Email: patty@calfoeakes.com

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

By: *s/ Daniel A. Rosen*

Daniel A. Rosen, NYBA #2790442
(*pro hac vice*)
452 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Phone: (212) 626-4272
Email: daniel.rosen@bakermckenzie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

By: s/ *Stephen S. Ho*

Stephen S. Ho
Trial Attorney, Tax Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Post Office Box 227
Washington, DC 20044
Tel: (202) 616-8994
Email: stephen.s.ho@usdoj.gov

Attorney for Defendant Internal Revenue Service